

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,904	10/26/2006	Volker Sauermann	11884/495701	3937
53000 7590 KENYON & KENYON LLP 1500 K STREET N.W.			EXAMINER	
			CHAO, MICHAEL W	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2442	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/15/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/584,904	SAUERMANN, VOLKER				
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Michael Chao	2442				
All Participants: Status of Application:						
(1) <u>Michael Chao</u> . (3) <u>Robert L. Hails</u> .						
(2) <u>Andrew Caldwell</u> .	(4) Shiao Min Huang.					
Date of Interview: 10 June 2009	Time: 4 PM EST					
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:						
Part I.						
Rejection(s) discussed: Leinberger						
Claims discussed:						
Draft amended claim 1 (see attachment)						
Prior art documents discussed: Leinberger, Walser (US 6,031,984)						
Part II.						
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet						
Part III.						
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 						
/Andrew Caldwell/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2442						
(4	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature - if appropriate)				

Application No. 10/584,904

- Shiao Min Huang provided a summary of applicants invention and explianed how applicants believe Leinberger operates.
- Robert Hails presented reasons as to why Leinberger does not teach draft claim 1 as recited in attachment.
- Examiner Chao presented results of updated search, Walser, which teaches iterating a constraint model using
 different starting variables. In the case of Bin Packing, job sizes and bins are the only variables, therefore performing
 multiple iterations of a Bin Packing process, described in Leinberger, would be obvious in view of Walser.
- Examiner does not believe draft claim 1 would overcome Leinberger, in view of Walser.
- Since the applicant was not aware of Walser prior to the interview, it was agreed that applicant would review reference and a followup interview would be scheduled prior to Thursday of the following week (6/18/2009).